IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

WEDNESDAY, THE 7TH FEBRUARY 2007 / 18TH MAGHA 1928

Bail Appl..No. 533 of 2007()

---

CRIME NO. 710 OF 2006 OF VAIKOM POLICE STATION

PETITIONER:

---

SREELA VINAYAKUMAR, AGED 28 YEARS,
W/O. K.VINAYAKUMAR, PUTHENTHARA HOUSE,
PALLIPURATHUSSERY P.O., VAIKOM.

BY ADV. SRI.P.SANJAY
SRI.A.PARVATHI MENON

RESPONDENTS:

---

STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA (SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VAIKOM POLICE STATION, VAIKOM).

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI. JAI GEORGE

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 07/02/2007, ALONG WITH BA NO. 535 OF 2007 THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V. RAMKUMAR, J.

---

Bail Application Nos. 533 and 535 of 2007

---

DATED: 7th February, 2007

O R D E R

The common petitioner in these bail applications are accused Nos. 4 and 7 respectively in Crime Nos. 710 and 839 of 2006 of Vaikom Police Station registered for various offences including Section 420 I.P.C., seeks anticipatory bail.

2. In her earlier applications for anticipatory bail filed as B.A. Nos. 245 and 244 of 2007 respectively this Court was not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. But at the same, this Court was inclined to give the petitioner an opportunity to appear before the investigating officer for custodial interrogation and then to have her regular bail application disposed of by the Magistrate concerned. Instead of availing the opportunity of the said benefit under the said common order passed by this Court on 18-01-2007, the petitioner has again approached this Court seeking the very same relief by filing applications for anticipatory

bail on the ground that one Latha Babu who was similarly situated as the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court. In the case of Latha Babu, she cannot be equated on par with the petitioner. It was noticed that she is an advocate whose professional career would be in jeopardy if she was arrested by the police. Even in the case of the petitioner, this Court was indulgent enough to direct that she will be interrogated only after due notice. Such being the position, these 2nd applications for the very same relief cannot be entertained and are accordingly dismissed.

V.RAMKUMAR, JUDGE

ani-